



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/994,600	11/19/2001	Douglas H. Anderson	CYPR-CD01174M	8949

7590 10/21/2004
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Thrid Floor
Two North Market Street
San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER

STORK, KYLE R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2178

DATE MAILED: 10/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/994,600	ANDERSON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kyle R Stork	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 November 2001.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the application filed 19 November 2001.
2. Claims 1-26 are pending. Claims 1, 11, 17, and 24 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As per dependent claim 25, the applicant discloses the "method as described in Claim 21..." However, claim 21 is directed toward a computer readable medium. This renders claim 25 indefinite.

As per dependent claim 26, the applicant discloses the "method as described in Claim 21..." However, claim 21 is directed toward a computer readable medium. Furthermore, claim 26 contains limitations substantially similar to those in claim 17, which claim 21 is dependent upon. These render claim 26 indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2178

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-7, 10-23, and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brooke et al. (US 6748569, 2004) in further view of Bauwens et al. (US 6704893, 2004).

As per independent claim 1, Brooke discloses the method for generating a project datasheet in an integrated design environment comprising:

- Accessing project data from an XML database structure (column 6, lines 18-20)
- Accessing an XSL stylesheet (column 6, lines 23-26)
- Processing the project data according to the XSL stylesheet to automatically produce a project datasheet file (column 6, lines 11-26; column 6, lines 33-42)

Brooke fails to disclose the project data describing an electronic system design for implementation on a programmable electronic device. Bauwens discloses the project data describing an electronic system design for implementation on a programmable electronic device (column 4, lines 11-22: Here, the integrated circuit is an electronic system design, and the details about the inputs and outputs are the implementation of that system).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Brooke's method of storing data in an XML database structure with Bauwens' project data describing an electronic system design, since it would have allowed a user to specify customized data structures for dealing with the system design (Brooke: column 6, lines 18-21).

Art Unit: 2178

As per dependent claim 2, Brooke and Bauwens disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Brooke further discloses the method further including formatting the data sheet in HTML (column 8, lines 7-17: Here, the XSP processor and XSP script act upon the XML tree to format the datasheet into an HTML file).

As per dependent claim 3, Brooke and Bauwens disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 2, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Brooke further discloses the method further including rendering the project datasheet as a visual output datasheet using a browser (column 8, lines 9-15; column 5, lines 60-62).

As per dependent claim 4, Brooke and Bauwens disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Brooke further discloses the method further including displaying said project datasheet (column 5, lines 57-62).

As per dependent claim 5, Brooke and Bauwens disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 4, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Brooke further discloses the method wherein displaying the project datasheet is done as a single action display (column 5, lines 60-62; column 4, lines 58-62).

As per dependent claim 6, Brooke and Bauwens disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 4, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Brooke further discloses the method wherein displaying the project datasheet includes printing the project datasheet (column 4, lines 58-62: Here, the fact that the system is equipped with a printer allows for the data sheet to be printed if the user desires).

Art Unit: 2178

As per dependent claim 7, Brooke and Bauwens disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 4, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Bauwens further discloses the method integrated circuit pinout assignment data (column 4, lines 11-22).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Brooke and Bauwens' method of displaying a project datasheet with Bauwens' method of including integrated circuit pinout data, since it would have allowed a user to view pinout data in a formatted display (Brooke: column 6, lines 35-38).

As per dependent claim 10, Brooke and Bauwens disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 4, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Bauwens further discloses the method including input and output configuration data (column 4, lines 11-22).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Brooke and Bauwens' method of displaying a project datasheet with Bauwens' method of including input and output configuration data, since it would have allowed a user to view input and output configuration data in a formatted display (Brooke: column 6, lines 35-38).

As per independent claim 11, the applicant recites similar limitations as claim 1, and is similarly rejected under Brooke and Bauwens.

As per dependent claim 12, Brooke and Bauwens disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 11, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. The applicant

Art Unit: 2178

recites similar limitations as claim 2, and is similarly rejected under Brooke and Bauwens.

As per dependent claim 13, Brooke and Bauwens disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 11, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. The applicant recites similar limitations as claim 3, and is similarly rejected under Brooke and Bauwens.

As per dependent claim 14, Brooke and Bauwens disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 11, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. The applicant recites similar limitations as claim 4, and is similarly rejected under Brooke and Bauwens.

As per dependent claim 15, Brooke and Bauwens disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 11, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. The applicant recites similar limitations as claim 6, and is similarly rejected under Brooke and Bauwens.

As per dependent claim 16, Brooke and Bauwens disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 11, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. The applicant recites similar limitations as claim 7, and is similarly rejected under Brooke and Bauwens.

As per independent claim 17, the applicant recites similar limitations as claim 1, and is similarly rejected under Brooke and Bauwens.

As per dependent claim 18, Brooke and Bauwens disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 17, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. The applicant

Art Unit: 2178

recites similar limitations as claim 2, and is similarly rejected under Brooke and Bauwens.

As per dependent claim 19, Brooke and Bauwens disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 18, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. The applicant recites similar limitations as claim 3, and is similarly rejected under Brooke and Bauwens.

As per dependent claim 20, Brooke and Bauwens disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 17, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. The applicant recites similar limitations as claim 4, and is similarly rejected under Brooke and Bauwens.

As per dependent claim 21, Brooke and Bauwens disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 17, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. The applicant recites similar limitations as claim 5, and is similarly rejected under Brooke and Bauwens.

As per dependent claim 22, Brooke and Bauwens disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 17, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. The applicant recites similar limitations as claim 6, and is similarly rejected under Brooke and Bauwens.

As per dependent claim 23, Brooke and Bauwens disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 17, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. The applicant recites similar limitations as claim 7, and is similarly rejected under Brooke and Bauwens.

Art Unit: 2178

As per dependent claim 25, Brooke and Bauwens disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 21, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. The applicant recites similar limitations as claim 3, and is similarly rejected under Brooke and Bauwens.

As per dependent claim 26, Brooke and Bauwens disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 21, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. The applicant recites similar limitations as claim 1, and is similarly rejected under Brooke and Bauwens.

7. Claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brooke and Bauwens in further view of Gristede et al. (US 6175949, 2001).

As per dependent claim 8, Brooke and Bauwens disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Brooke and Bauwens fail to disclose including a user module schematic. However, Gristede discloses a user module schematic (Figures 3-8: These figures are user module schematics).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Brooke and Bauwens' method of displaying a project datasheet with Gristede's method of including a user module schematic, since it would have allowed the user to view a pictographic representation of the data.

As per dependent claim 9, Brooke and Bauwens disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Brooke and Bauwens fail to disclose including global parameters. However, Gristede discloses global parameters (column 11, lines 23-32).

Art Unit: 2178

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Brooke and Bauwens' method of displaying project datasheet with Gristede's method of including global parameters, since it would have allowed a user to see not only a list of parameters used, but also the effects of the parameters on the parameters.

8. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bauwens and Gristede in further view of Object Domain R3 (March 2001) and XMI (2000).

As per independent claim 24, Gristede and Bauwens disclose the computer control method for generating design information comprising:

- A plurality of global parameters (Gristede column 11, lines 23-32)
- A plurality of programmable hardware resources (Gristede column 3, lines 48-53)
- At least one user module representing a circuit design (Bauwens column 4, lines 11-22)

Bauwens and Gristede fail to disclose:

- Parameterizing the user module
- Establishing connections to the user module
- Automatically generating a datasheet file describing an electronic design project comprising the user module as parameterized, its connections and said global parameters

XMI discloses:

Art Unit: 2178

- Parameterizing the user module (section 1.2.1.2: Here, the document is mapped to the correct interface)

Object Domain R3 discloses:

- Establishing connections to the user module (page 1: Here, by generating the XMI document, Object Domain connects to the original model document to create the datasheet file)
- Automatically generating a datasheet file describing an electronic design project comprising the user module as parameterized, its connections and said global parameters (page 1: Here, Object Domain generates an XMI file)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Bauwens and Gristede's method of modeling circuit design with XMI and Object Domain's method of parameterizing a module and generating a datasheet file, since it would have allowed a user to generate an XML compliant file to describe his/her module (XMI: section 1.3).

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- US 20040205617A1 Light: Disclose report generator using XML and XSL.
- US 20040205553A1 Hall et al.: Disclose page layout markup language.
- US 20030058469A1 Buis et al.: Discloses printing XML directly using a format template.

Art Unit: 2178

- US 20030014447A1 White: Discloses document generator.
- US 20020161802A1 Gabrick et al.: Discloses web presentation.
- US 20020152234A1 Estrada et al.: Discloses importing HTML forms.
- US 20020138516A1 Igra: Discloses using master specifications for web page design.
- US 20020073119A1 Richard: Discloses converting data from one markup language to another markup language.
- US006507857B1 Yalcinalp: Discloses XSL style sheet including components for transformations.
- US006397232B1 Cheng-Hung et al.: Discloses translating the format of a document file.
- US 20020152449A1 Lin: Discloses generating a design hierarchy.
- US006539534B1 Bennett: Discloses automatic generation of circuit designs.
- US 20020161568A1 Sample et al.: Discloses memory circuit for use in hardware emulation.
- US20010044927A1 Karniewicz: Discloses population of cells of a semiconductor.
- US20020068989A1 Ebisawa et al.: Discloses integrated circuit and storage medium.
- US20020010716A1 McCartney et al.: Discloses publication of XML compliant documents.
- US20020023110A1 Fortin et al.: Discloses document markup language and generation of documents in the language.

Art Unit: 2178

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyle R Stork whose telephone number is (571) 272-4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (7:00-3:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (703) 308-5465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kyle Stork
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2178



**STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER**